Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies Vol. •• No. •• (2019) doi: 10.1111/1754-0208.12667

Branding Angelica: Reputation Management in Late Eighteenth-Century England

AMANDA VICKERY

Abstract: Reputation management is a contemporary offshoot of public relations, but reputation has long had economic currency in British culture. Less well studied is the way commercial reputation consolidated around ideas of the brand. This case study of the London career of the Swiss-born artist Angelica Kauffman (1741-1807) examines the development of the 'Angelica' brand: from stage-managed debut, studio establishment and performance, and self-promotion through self-portraiture to market positioning, diffusion lines and pricing strategy. It tests the success of Kauffman's efforts by examining critical reception, consumer response and, finally, damage limitation, concluding that the Angelica brand was the painter's cleverest creation.

Keywords: neo-classism, taste, female artists, Angelica Kauffman, reputation, celebrity and brand, public and private, women in business, scandal and risk

Reputation management is a contemporary offshoot of public relations and branding, but reputation has long had economic currency in British culture. Shakespeare believed a good reputation to be 'the purest treasure mortal times afford' and had Iago declaim: 'He who steals my purse steals trash [...] but he that filches from me my good name [...] makes me poor indeed.'[1] A personal reputation for honour, probity and orderliness was vital for credit, without which no early modern enterprise could function. A person's credit depended on their perceived moral worth as well as apparent economic standing, and was fundamental to trust in countless daily transactions. One could barely subsist in a cash poor economy without creditworthiness.[2]

Notoriously, however, honourable reputation meant different things for ladies and gentlemen. Male honour rested on the reliability of words, strength of character and bolstering status and wealth. Female honour stood on a more limited foundation – sexual virtue. A woman had to be, and moreover be seen to be, utterly chaste. Countervailing wealth, rank, character, courage or intellect could not retrieve a fallen virtue.[3] Meanwhile the eighteenth century has been identified as a critical epoch in the emergence of 'celebrity' – a species of crafted and publicised reputation. The strategies used by actresses, intellectuals, novelists, singers and artists to forge an audience and defend their cultural production have drawn increasing attention from scholars of literature and art history. Less well studied is the way commercial reputation consolidated around ideas of the brand. This article bridges these currents in a case study of the London career of the Swiss-born artist Angelica Kauffman (1741-1807).

Claiming Kauffman as a brand pioneer is not an anachronistic exercise. Branding is an intense preoccupation of business and marketing today, but makers' marks are as old as antiquity. The term 'brand' derives from the old Norse *brandyr* ('to burn').[4] Economic historians are currently investigating the centrality of brands to international markets in medieval Europe and the early modern world.[5] The brand was already more than a

symbol of production or a mere label; it was something more subtle – an identity. As Carlo Marco Belfanti concludes of early modern practice: 'The brand, while basing itself on the trademark for legal protection, incorporates a personality and an identity, inspires the consumer with feelings, memories, behaviour and fidelity.'[6] Josiah Wedgwood is celebrated for his entrepreneurship and marketing in Georgian Britain: among a galaxy of vases, teapots and plaques, Wedgwood's products were the first to be widely known among consumers by maker. There were teapots, and then there were Wedgwood teapots. However he was not alone in strategy.[7] It is the contention of this article that Kauffman, who worked closely with Wedgwood and uniquely among cultural producers was almost universally known by her Christian name, had created a strong artistic brand.

'The whole world is Angelicamad', laughed the Danish ambassador in 1781.[8] Few eighteenth-century artists were more successful or famous than Kauffman. She produced an estimated 1,500 history paintings, portraits and decorative designs, and made a fortune. Her funeral in Rome in 1807 was orchestrated by Canova with all the pomp of a state burial.[9] And yet Kauffman's reputation withered. 'She slipped into oblivion after her death in 1807', notes her biographer, 'seeming too fey and classical to the Romantic era and too playfully insubstantial to the solid age of bourgeois materialism.'[10] As early as 1793, John Hoppner saw Kauffman as indicative of 'the general bad taste which prevails in this country'. Along with 'silly poetry [...] the works of Angelica &c in painting have captivated the publick so as to corrupt the taste.'[11] John Constable despised the mannerist tradition to which she belonged for its decadent 'prettiness'. In 1836 he lectured that the likes of 'Mengs, Cipriani, Angelica Kauffman & c' were promoters of an 'emasculated taste' in history painting.[12]

In reaction, feminist art historians have recuperated Kauffman's importance. Angela Rosenthal argues that the painter contributed to the major cultural concerns of her time, propounding sensibility but also presenting herself as its embodiment. Wendy Wassyng Roworth argues that Kauffman recast the epic in feminine terms, pursuing historical themes but foregrounding female dilemmas. She was compelled by the subject of grieving and deserted women – Dido, Ariadne, Calypso – and defined the subject of Penelope in art.[13] If one of the measures of success of a particular painting is whether or not it was reproduced, 'few painters of either sex can have been more successful than Angelica Kauffman', concludes Germaine Greer.[14]

Notoriously, however, Johan Joseph Zoffany's institutional portrait of the Academicians excluded Kauffman and her colleague Mary Moser as living entities.[15] They appear only virtually, in two indistinct portraits on the back wall. Their physical absence is justified by the setting within the life class, from which women were barred. It celebrates the 'academic life-class as an exclusively masculine endeavour', concludes Rosenthal.[16] Zoffany's painting is read as confirmation that female institutional accreditation was grudging and tokenistic at best.[17]

However, a social and economic historian might take another view, surprised that women were acknowledged at all. There were no equivalent platforms accessible to women in law, medicine, science, politics, local government, the universities or the military. Literature was the only professional field in which women were prominent, but their standing owed little to institutions. Women were excluded from the Linnean Society, the Society of Antiquaries and the Royal Society, to which the first female fellows were elected in 1904, 1921 and 1945 respectively. Nor were women welcome at the Society of Dilettanti. By comparison, the fraternity of artists was open.[18]

If we consider Kauffman's career less as an artist than as a businesswoman, a different set of historiographical assumptions come into play. Kauffman ran a self-employed

business in a hostile commercial world. Economic historians have stressed the restrictions female traders faced. Women were excluded from most of the trade guilds, though widows were entitled to run their dead husband's businesses, with some guild privileges transferred.[19] As Amy Erickson argues, women's enterprises were severely restricted by three factors: women's minimal opportunities for skilled training, their domestic labour responsibilities and 'the law of coverture, whereby a married woman's financial relations were entirely subject to her husband's control'. Nevertheless, paid work was a necessity for most spinsters, widows and impoverished wives, but even the 'wives of craft masters and professional men' ran businesses in Erickson's sample. Indeed she concludes that the majority of married women in London worked, paying servants and nurses for childcare.[20] Even so, the range of female businesses was not wide. While occasional women succeeded in the luxury trades,[21] the majority were concentrated in retail, food and drink, and textiles. Peter Earle considers these businesses deemed suitable and domestic, though Erickson disputes the idea that these should necessarily be deemed 'feminine' sectors.[22] Within middling families, women's enterprises were seen as supplementary and supportive to the businesses of their men.[23] And women's efforts were barely supported by institutions. Only 'an infinitesimal fraction of the female population' were full members of the livery companies, Erickson finds.[24] As she concludes, in the context of milliners, 'any culture which can use the same word, "mistress", as a term of honour and a term of degradation will find a way to undermine a businesswoman on account of her sex'.[25] The market-place was far harder to navigate for women than for equivalent businessmen.

Historians of eighteenth-century gender have noted the continuing constraints on women's public lives. The eighteenth century saw a burst of writing that sentimentalised femininity, but marriage, motherhood and domesticity were still woman's natural environment.[26] Commercialised public life boomed, but respectable females charted this new world with infinite discretion.[27] It was one thing for ladies to consume high culture, but quite another to produce it for money. 'Publick practice of any art [...] and staring in men's faces is very indelicate in a female', Samuel Johnson opined, concluding 'portrait-painting is an improper employment for a woman'.[28] The artist Robert Smirke worried that his daughter, 'very desirous of painting in oil', was risking her reputation, doubting 'of its not being a manner of practising the art suitable to the Sex' and wondered 'whether to confine Her views to Miniature painting'.[29] Seeking public acclaim was subversive of female delicacy. Even the amateur artist could be spoilt by exhibition.[30]

Kauffman pursued and benefited, but also suffered, from public attention. 'I am now known by everyone here and in the public eye', she wrote in 1766.[31] She therefore also belongs to the history of celebrity. The word 'celebrity' denoting an individual was coined in 1849, however the post-1688 information economy (comparative freedom of the press, lax libel laws, the flowering of commercialised entertainment and the broadcasting of imagery via print reproduction) meant that the Georgian cultural firmament was studded with popular personalities, from admirals to beauties, lionised and dissected in the press and visual culture.[32] Art historians, historians and literary scholars have noted how adeptly some cultural producers, especially actresses, used both press and public audience to their professional advantage.[33] Felicity Nussbaum argues that great actresses projected 'a commoditized version of the self', offering glimpses of an off-stage personality, to create 'the illusion of availability' to thrill their fans.[34] By contrast, Bluestocking authors engineered a blameless decorum, a 'strictness of modesty', in their personal lives to counter any unladylike implications of forcing their ideas on the public.[35] If they lowered their guard, the press could be vitriolic. When the middle-aged historian Catherine Macaulay entered a ménage with an admirer thirty years her senior, the satirists were gleeful. She

only added fuel to the fire in 1778 by then marrying a seaman twenty-six years her junior. As the *European Magazine* reflected in 1783, Macaulay had 'experienced more of the extremes of adulation and obloquy than any one of her own sex in the literary world'.[36] A besmirched reputation could be economically ruinous and/or socially disastrous. Disgraced noblewomen, for instance, were ostracised and had to cloister themselves in the country or abroad.[37] Fame and celebrity were constitutive of both commercial and fashionable reputation, though the boundary between acclaim and notoriety was fine and fluid. Being in the public eye was fraught with risk.

What follows is not a traditional exercise in art history that draws on visual analysis and knowledge of dominant conventions of visual representation, but rather a cultural history that draws on material from across disciplines (economic history, art history, gender history, English, business studies) that have explored public identity, the representation of gender and the role of commercial reputation. Today a brand can be defined in three overlapping ways: a named product or service, a trademark and a set of associations for the consumer – what historians would call 'commercial reputation' and today's specialists call 'brand equity'. The reputation of a brand cannot be bought and sold (though a trademark can), but it has enormous value to a company, so senior managers have to be good stewards of brand equity. Strong brands have substantial reserves of brand equity, which allow them to weather setbacks and scandals. Some brand identities, such as Apple, are seen to be so strong as to enjoy brand immunity, evoking such customer loyalty that they can be forgiven occasional product failures.[38] Corporations invariably have a public relations department, and may even employ consultants in 'reputation management'.[39] This article examines the launch and development of a brand: from stage-managed debut, studio establishment and performance, self-promotion through self-portraiture, to market positioning, diffusion lines and pricing strategy. It tests the success of Kauffman's efforts via an examination of critical reception, consumer response and finally damage limitation. Admittedly, the self-consciousness of Kauffman's practice cannot be demonstrated at length through personal manuscripts. Characteristically, Kauffman instructed that her private records be burned. However, as an unusual public figure she provoked comment, her work is copious and what little survives in her own hand is suggestive.[40] Her behaviour as well as her products was constitutive of her commercial reputation, as she was well aware.

Aristocratic patronage, genteel associations and the appearance of decorum were all vital to Kauffman's entrée into the lucrative British market-place for portraiture. Kauffman was already known to Grand Tourists in Rome. She spoke four languages and wrote flawlessly in English. Like most female artists, Kauffman was the daughter of an artist. She benefited from her father's chaperonage but supervised her own career, supporting him financially, along with a young cousin. By her mid-twenties she was essentially her own manager and public relations secretary. To prime the London art market before her debut, she sent a portrait of the actor–manager David Garrick ahead for exhibition at the Free Society in London. Garrick's celebrity alone guaranteed some advance publicity. Kauffman arrived in June 1766 under the sponsorship of Lady Wentworth, the wife of the Venice consul, and took lodgings with a surgeon's family.[41] She considered herself modestly established in four rooms (one a studio, one a painting store), trying to economise during her first winter in London. Within days she was introduced to Joshua Reynolds, and sufficiently gained his confidence that he sat to her for his portrait. Reynolds probably assisted Kauffman in gaining commissions thereafter.

One of the ways brands insinuate themselves into higher markets is via the location, design and atmosphere of their retail outlets. A studio-cum-gallery was a prerequisite of

success on the London art market. 'Every portrait painter in England has a room to show his pictures separate from that in which he works', marvelled a French visitor in 1755.[42] The artist's home studio was a promotional tool – workspace, performance space, gallery and shopfront rolled into one. In 1760 Joshua Reynolds bought 'a handsome house' in Leicester Square 'to which he added a splendid gallery for the exhibition of his works, and a commodious and elegant room for his sitters'. The appearance of success was needful, but could be ruinous. Reynolds noted three artists in financial straits, having over-extended themselves in establishment.[43]

Kauffman delayed the arrival of her father and her cousin Rosa Florini till she was established. Portraiture was a buyer's market, so receiving customers elegantly was vital. '[T]he most refined ladies come to the house to sit – to visit me – or to see my work. I would not receive people of such high rank in an ill appointed house.' To win the patronage of ladies she had to pass for one of them. 'We would have to have a servant and a maid – decorum demands it.'[44] By the spring of 1767 Kauffman had taken a rented house in genteel Golden Square, Soho. How the house was furnished is elusive; Kauffman's surviving account book dates from after her return to Rome. The fact that the studio was now part of a familial household, nominally presided over by her father, reinforced an air of domesticity and subordination. Herr Kauffman was an economic appendage, but important to the painter's virtuous reputation.

Kauffman followed her brother artists in attempting to mirror the status of her clientele; however, she faced extra pressures as a woman. The Georgian studio was a liminal space, a shop masquerading as a private apartment, hovering between public and private, but also between fashionable and louche.[45] Kauffman was seen to craft a force field of decorum, which countered the disreputable associations of the studio milieu. 'She has a peculiar and most womanly dignity which inspires the utmost respect', noted a visiting Danish statesman in 1768.[46] Kauffman neutralised the risqué associations of female flaunting with a self-presentation that was ever soothing and saintly, making the most of her continental cachet, musical talents, quiet charm and sensibility. The sight of a pretty young woman painting was beguiling enough, but Kauffman also recited uplifting poetry, or had someone read aloud while she worked, and often gave impromptu recitals.[47]

Kauffman's musicality bears examination. In later years she celebrated her choice between art and music in epic terms, echoing Hercules' dilemma but also Reynolds's depiction of Garrick deliberating between tragedy and comedy (Fig. 1).[48] Professional female musicianship was conceivable but precarious. The *émigrée* soprano trilling frivolous Italian opera was the prototype diva, but she never threw off the whiff of voluptuousness.[49] No true lady could perform in public for money, but amateur musicality was *de rigueur* on the marriage market.[50] Kauffman sang and played the guitar and the glass harmonica – a new instrument associated with women, which audiences found ethereal. Her voice and repertoire also conjured the heavens. Kauffman struck the Danish statesman Count Bernsdoff as less a prima donna than a saint at prayer: 'in divine service [she] opens her large, yearning eyes [...] she becomes an enchanting prototype of St Cecilia'.[51] The Roman martyr could play any instrument, but used music to commune with God. Joshua Reynolds painted the soprano Elizabeth Linley as St Cecilia in 1775, her saintliness asserted (though not entirely secured) by performance in choral works other than opera and by her abstention from public recital, at her husband's behest.[52] Hackneyed or not, being likened to the patron saint of music helped build Kauffman's reputation for thoroughgoing virtue, a character that would serve her well.

Kauffman staged her unworldliness, working up a culturally improving atmosphere of sensibility, quasi-religious intensity and salon encounter.[53] The domestic setting and the

1. Angelica Kauffman, Self-Portrait of the Artist Hesitating between the Arts of Music and Painting, 1794, 71 x 98 inches, oil on canvas, Nostell Priory, Yorkshire, National Trust. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

decorum of visiting were also critical. Thereby Kauffman aligned herself with gifted amateurs and the natural refinement of ladies of rank. (The term 'amateur' was coming to mean an individual performing for pleasure, not financial advantage, though 'amateurish' had not yet gained the pejorative implication of inferior to professional productions.[54]) Even Kauffman's singing was politely pitched, echoing the lightness of chamber singing and the purity of the English choral tradition, rather than the brilliance and voluptuousness of opera. Finally, her air of communion with her muse conjured genius rather than the grubbiness of commerce.

To succeed a brand has to be clearly defined. The strongest brands today are seen to share three attributes: 'a compelling idea', 'a resolute core purpose and supporting values' and 'a central organizing principle'.[55] Kauffman had all three. She was a unique female history painter. She promoted virtuous learning in her art and sought to embody it. Her studio practice, associates and social behaviour were all of a piece with her artistic rectitude. Kauffman's thoroughgoing seemliness illuminates her aesthetic style. She used her own image in oils to project her artistic self as indivisible from her commercial product. Her self-portraits represent a cocktail of learning, virtue and worldly innocence.[56] The power she attached to her likeness as a broker of reputation is revealed by the lengths to which she went to ensure that the small self-portrait first acquired by the Uffizi was replaced by 'another larger portrait [...] less unworthy of the company of so many remarkable painters and less unworthy of me'.[57] The Uffizi's collection of self-portraits is a pantheon of art history. Even today only 7 per cent of the collection are by women. The forty-seven-year-old presented herself in white as an ageless vestal guarding the temple

of Minerva. To Kauffman's satisfaction she was hung beside Michelangelo. Kauffman was hardly innocent of ambition or strategy.

It was Kauffman's history painting that secured her most praise from the art establishment. Sir Joshua Reynolds, the Royal Academy, leaders of taste and female intellectuals all acknowledged her importance as a unique female history painter. History paintings were typically monumental studies of episodes drawn from the Hebrew Bible, distant history and myth, deploying allegory and signalling intellectual reach. Feminist art historians note that Kauffman softened the martial epic – spotlighting the contest between love and war, the agony of the deserted women but also the fortitude of female heroes such as the crafty Penelope, queen of Ithaca. Foregrounding heroines of history advertised her own unique status as a female history painter, but also gestured to female taste.[58] Kauffman broke new ground in representing medieval British history. Since 1760 the Society of Artists offered premiums for paintings depicting scenes from British history, but only Kauffman and Benjamin West took up the challenge. Most famously, West's *Death of General Wolfe* depicted the soldier's demise in the battle of Quebec (1759) as a scene of masculine lamentation. West would offer a similar all-male *pietà* on the death

2. Angelica Kauffman, The Tender Eleanora Sucking the Venom Out of the Wound Which Edward I, Her Royal Consort, Received with a Poisoned Dagger from an Assassin in Palestine, c.1780, 34 x 42 inches, oil on canvas, The Huntington Library, Art Museum, and Botanical Gardens, San Marino, CA. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

of Nelson in 1805. He was unusual in depicting heroes in contemporary dress and insisting that recent events qualified for epic treatment. However only Kauffman depicted British *heroines* – Rowena, Elfrida and Eleanor – asserting the deep roots of female history in Albion (Fig. 2).

Mastery of history painting assumed the ability to depict the human form in dynamic poses. Life-drawing, anatomy lessons, public dissections and the handling of cadavers developed a grasp of the body. This visceral training was anathema to respectable femininity. Kauffman always protested that she had never drawn naked men from life, only sketching clothed men while chaperoned by her father, a claim her surviving sketchbooks support.[59] She was especially ambiguous about male nakedness. Roworth notes Kauffman's 'resourceful caution', flanking around her ignorance, depicting heroes in domestic moments or disguised as women.[60] Mockery of Kauffman's effeminate men was common. Nevertheless the androgyny of her figures also reflected the tastes of the German antiquarian Winckelmann, from whom she derived her neo-classical enthusiasm.[61] Moreover her vagueness about anatomy was a badge of modesty, proof of 'the delicacy of her sex'.[62]

In any case, Kauffman's female patrons had little argument with her gentle men. In a love letter to her first husband in 1781, Lady Elizabeth Foster lauded his public roles – 'anxious farmer, impartial Justice of the Peace, intrepid warrior' – but set still greater store by 'those finer traits wch pencil out the Husband and the Father [...] Angelica has saved me the task by perpetuating an exact resemblance of you.'[63] Moreover the understatement and placidity of her history painting were strokes of commercial genius. Kauffman's tableaux harmonised with fashionable 'all of a piece Classicism', and were easier to live with than battlefields and blood.[64] Spotlighting gracious historical heroines may also have been a strategy to appeal to a lucrative female clientele for portraiture. Polite history painting created the market for polite historicised portraiture. Kauffman's female subjects are often depicted in quasi-historical dress, in the guise of muses or gesturing to antiquities. Cumulatively, artistic deficiency seems less pronounced than the fact that Kauffman understood what a woman could offer, and what the market could bear.

One way that brands define themselves and their target consumers is by price. Kauffman positioned herself at the top end of the art market in oils. Reportedly Reynolds advised her on prices. Initially, she charged 20 guineas for a head, 40 for a half-length and 60 for a full-length: less than Reynolds, but similar rates to Gainsborough and more than Romney.[65] At no point did she convey that her work was worth less because she was female.[66] Observers may have muttered that she set her fees too high, but there is no evidence that her customers contested her rates.[67] Kauffman's profitability was much remarked on.[68]

While retaining her position at the top of the market, Kauffman harnessed new media to reach wider provincial, national and international audiences. The new technologies of reproduction had an exponential impact on her reputation. Kauffman advertised her own engravings to be sold for a guinea.[69] She probably created paintings deliberately to appeal to the print trade.[70] Certainly she was knowledgeable about the skills of engravers.[71] At least seventy-five engravers copied her work. Circumstantial evidence suggests that Kauffman entered into commercial relationships to license reproduction.[72] Even after her departure to Rome in 1781, she sent back paintings to be engraved. Moreover Kauffman was one of the few artists who welcomed 'mechanical painting', a pioneering technique of colour reproduction developed by Matthew Boulton in the 1770s. She was without snobbery about product design and interior decoration, excelling in producing designs for ceilings, walls and objects, depicting scenes from Greek and Roman legend,

with a light Rococo touch.[73] Robert Adam found her delicate neo-classicism ideal for his interiors.[74] Decorations derived from her paintings appeared on Worcester, Derby and Sèvres porcelain and occasionally on Wedgwood's fashionable earthenwares, but also on fans, furniture and needlework.

Kauffman left no record of strategy, but tangential evidence of her commercial deals, as well as her own skill as an engraver, intimate that she both franchised her brand and drew financial benefit from a diffusion line. Doubtless pirated versions also proliferated, though no complaints from Kauffman have survived. In any case, illegal reproduction would still disseminate her name. Kauffman's imagery circulated far beyond London exhibitions and aristocratic saloons, pervading polite British and European homes and personifying fashionable good taste.[75]

Critical reception is one measure of reputation. The fact that Reynolds esteemed Kauffman's work is clear from his borrowing of her pose of Garrick for his *Miss Prue* and the fact that he sat to her for his portrait. The intellectual effort Kauffman put into history painting, the very genre Reynolds sought to exalt, may also account for his support. Reviews tended to praise Kauffman's history paintings and appreciated the energy she put into promoting the genre in England. The *London Chronicle* of May 1777 reported on her painting of *Calypso Mournful after the Departure of Ulysses*, exhibited at the annual exhibition:

> Miss Kauffman still maintains her character as one of the first history-painters of the age; and so strong is the turn of her genius to that sublime branch of art, that while most of the male pencils in the kingdom are employed in portraits, landscapes &c. she gives us, every succeeding year, fresh proofs of the vigour of her mind by producing something excellent in the historical way.[76]

Kauffman was congratulated for her compositions, her superior 'taste in drawing the human figure' and for 'the true tragic spirit' and 'infinite deal of character, and sweetness' that pervaded her work[77] Some deplored 'a greyness', limited '*relief of colours*' or a 'colouring like brickdust'.[78] This critique was more ideological than personal, as 'brickdust' was code for 'continental' among partisans of the British school.[79] More telling was the charge of unoriginality, disparaging her 'inanimate repetitions'.[80] The cumulative impression emerging from reviews is that Kauffman had built a reputation as a reliable and affecting, if repetitive, producer of history and pathos in the best possible taste.

Differentiation of product or message is seen as critical to the success of a brand today.[81] Kauffman appealed to a particular but extensive market. While most of her portraits in Italy had been of men, in England it was predominantly society women who sat to her.[82] A distinctive female market for culture and consumables had already been identified and exploited in England.[83] Luxury consumer brands today often seek celebrity endorsement. By August 1766 Kauffman's studio was on the fashionable beat.[84] Commissioned to paint Queen Charlotte, Kauffman privately exulted: 'No other painter has ever experienced such an honour the applause for my work is so great that the public papers mention it with praise.'[85]

How was Kauffman's reputation perceived by her consumers? Surviving commentary from individuals on why they commissioned paintings is notoriously sparse. Kauffman's most significant British patron, the glass manufacturer George Bowles of Wanstead, left no justification for his investment in over fifty canvases. However, considering the character of three leading female clients is instructive. Take the newly wed Lord and Lady Shelburne, who patronised Kauffman in the 1760s. They were remarkable for their high-minded engagement with enlightened learning alongside a devout fulfilment of the

sacraments of the Church of England. Sophia Lady Shelburne was tutored in botanical drawing, collected hot-house plants and exotic birds, took lessons on the guitar, sketched classical details and designed needlework.[86] Her diary exhibits a painstaking familiarity with current aesthetic ideals. It is significant therefore that Lady Shelburne selected Kauffman for her portrait. 'I went to Miss Angelica's to sit for the third time for my picture. I carried the Dutchess of Manchester with me & Lady Tweeddale met me there.'[87] That this virtuous aristocratic bride patronised an unmarried Catholic foreigner, and moreover met her noble friends at the studio, demonstrates the countenance the painter had achieved within a year of arrival. Kauffman's offer chimed with fashionable morality in the nobility. Her elevated, but unthreatening, neo-classicism complemented their new Adam interiors and commodes from Ince and Mayhew, decorated with images of Herculaneum and Palmyra.

One of Kauffman's most expressive clients was the stylish Theresa Parker, born in Vienna into a cosmopolitan clan of aristocrats and diplomats and named Theresa after her godmother, the empress of Austria. She married an exceedingly rich Devon gentleman, John Parker, and is credited with the redesign of the interiors at Saltram House. Reynolds acclaimed her as 'a woman of skill and exact judgment in fine arts [who] seemed to possess by a kind of intuition that propriety of taste and right-thinking which others but imper-

3. Angelica Kauffman, Hector Taking Leave of Andromache, 1768, 53 x 70 inches, oil on canvas, Saltram, Devon, National Trust. [Colour figure can be viewed at wileyonlinelibrary.com]

fectly acquire by hard labour'.[88] Parker's 'propriety of taste' was answered in Kauffman. 'You ask next what subjects Angelica painted for us', Theresa wrote her brother in 1775.

> The prettiest, and I think the best she ever did, is the painting of Hector and Andromache. We also got Ulysses discovering Achilles disguised in women's cloathes by his handling of the sword, Venus conducting Aeneas in the character of the huntress, Penelope hanging up Ulysses armour & two subjects out of the English history [...] the feast given up on the landing of the Saxons, where Rowena presents the cup to Vortigern, and Elfrida receiving Edgar.[89]

Parker's favourites all spotlight epic moments that stage heterosexual exchanges and foreground female dilemmas. The sheer femininity of Kauffman's history painting resonated with one of the most chic women in England.

Kauffman's feminised histories appealed to a literate female audience beyond her patrons. One did not have to possess a painting to appreciate the painter, or to ponder the value of female artistry. 'This morning we have been to see Mr West's and Mrs Angelica's paintings', reported the diarist Mrs Delany in 1771. 'My partiality leans to my sister painter [...] I like her history still better than her portraits.'[90] Kauffman exhibited four history paintings at the Royal Academy that year, three of them thematising the impact of war on women. Delany's preference for Kauffman's women's histories of over West's masculine tragedy *The Death of General Wolfe* is notable. Delany was acclaimed as an oracle of good taste.[91] Her approval confirms the congeniality of Kauffman's aesthetic point of view.

The ideological worldview of two less-known admirers bears examination. First let us consider the strenuously high-minded Anglican Anna Larpent (1758-1832). Her husband was Inspector of Plays in the office of the Lord Chamberlain. Larpent assisted reading the piles of manuscripts submitted for licensing, and she alone assessed the Italian plays. Nevertheless, Larpent believed that family duty was a woman's highest calling and criticised female professionalism.[92] After a party at a Mrs C Smith's in 1792, Larpent recorded Mrs Smith's 'paintings are wonderful, But I think being an Artist incompatible with the Duties of a good wife & Mother.[93]

That Kauffman won Larpent's approbation is an achievement of high-minded content over the dubiousness of female performance. As a demure maid on the marriage market in London in the 1770s and '80s, Miss Anna attended commercial venues with disquiet about fashionable life, though exhibitions caused no such consternation. She singled out Kauffman's history paintings at the Academy, but also at smaller shows: 'Went to an Exhibition of Angelica's principal pictures, Ryland's prints & Sandby's. I was much pleased particularly with Angelica's picture of lady Gray & King Edward.' A month later, she 'saw Angelica's pictures Much pleased; particularly with that of Hector and Andromache'. Although her critical bandwidth was limited – she 'noticed', 'was much pleased with' or found something 'fine', 'masterly' or 'beautiful' – she was not unobservant. She was alert to Kauffman's innovative diffusion by technical means but was not an uncritical fan of all that 'Angelica' produced, finding her technique faulty on occasion.[94] Nevertheless, at no point did Larpent raise the indelicacy of female professionalism. The fact that Kauffman was childless and effectively single may have been factors in Larpent's indulgence. There were no neglected infants to pity. Doubtless Kauffman's mild intellectual project – blending classicism, modesty and sensibility – resonated with Larpent's own learned moralism. Notably Larpent invariably called Kauffman by her Christian name (as did Parker, Delany and Foster among many others), whereas the male painters she commended were never hailed as Benjamin or Joshua. Kauffman's femaleness rendered her exceptional. Yet the Angelica brand went beyond mere gender. My research has yet to uncover another female painter hailed by her Christian name. Kauffman's celebrity encouraged

her admirers to familiarity, even personal identification with her. 'Angelica' had achieved exceptional recognition.

A provincial admirer was Katherine Plymley (1758-1829), an unmarried Anglican of liberal connections, a discriminating consumer, who participated in the Abolitionists' boycott of slave-grown sugar and responded to the aesthetic restraint of old Dissent. This Shropshire spinster prided herself on principled taste based on her reading of contemporary treatises on aesthetics, and was an amateur botanical artist of some skill. She admired 'a very large & pleasing picture by Angelica Kauffman' on a visit to nearby Attingham, either *Euphrosyne Complaining to Venus of the Wound Caused by Cupid's Dart* or *Bacchus and Ariadne*. Plymley called upon a familiarity with Kauffman's heroines to convey the qualities of her nephew's bride, in 1814:

She is a very fine woman her whole person has very much the air of Angelica Kauffman's figures, her face is handsome, with an expression of modesty, cheerfulness & good humour which is very pleasing [...] She appears perfectly free from affectation & in the little I have seen there is much propriety & good sense in her behaviour. [...] she moves with uncommon grace, & though very tall her figure is so finely proportioned that she does not appear the height she really is.[95]

The fact that this Shropshire Anglican took it for granted that her reader would be familiar with the look and mood of 'Angelica Kauffman's figures' is indicative of the reach of her reputation, or what business specialists would call 'brand awareness'. Kauffman and her painted women had an unmistakable gestalt, which conveyed beauty bound by decorum, virtue leavened by cheerfulness, grace free from affectation.

History paintings did not sell as well as portraits on the British market, but it was Kauffman's delicate histories that endeared her to her female audience. Her gentle epics raised her above the common run of portrait painters. Parker, Delany, Larpent and Plymley all singled out her mythological works as their favourites. All were amateur artists of varying ability. Three of the four were notably devout Anglicans and practitioners of botanical art. Perhaps the amateurs admired their 'sister artist' for her success, but it was probably Kauffman's virtuous learning, so gracefully worn, that flattered. Kauffman shone a little moonlight on propriety, and offered decorous ladies their ennobled reflection, in polite classical garb.

A strong brand is resilient in the face of reputational challenge, responding swiftly and constructively to criticism, or the withering of trust.[96] Kauffman's reputation was her fortune, but it was a brittle asset. To succeed, Kauffman had to accommodate a repressive gender ideology and a censorious public. Her status was never as secure as that of equivalent men. Despite Kauffman's reserve, male gossips attributed her success to flirtation rather than talent. 'She was courted at Rome by N Dance – by Hickey – & by Hamilton', gossiped Joseph Farington. In short, Kauffman 'was a cocquet, giving encouragement to a certain degree to all'. The source of the story was the embittered artist Nathaniel Dance, who had considered himself engaged to Kauffman in Rome, only to be jilted when better prospects glimmered in London. Dance claimed that Kauffman had 'shut Her door against Him' when her head was turned by Reynolds. Farington repeated versions of Dance's grievance even beyond the death of Kauffman, ensuring that the story lingered.[97]

Scepticism about Kauffman's character as a jilt is appropriate, however. The artist Isabella Hadfield, a beneficiary of Kauffman's generosity, acknowledged the tittle-tattle, but doubted that it was warranted. Hadfield warned her artist daughter Maria to take a clear line on a proposal of marriage lest she expose herself to the same slurs: 'don't make him hope if you have no intention for that will have you talk'd of as Angelica was for I don't believe half to be true as they say of her.'[98] Notwithstanding, these insults blamed

Kauffman for the very obligations under which she laboured as a female creative. Cultural servants of aristocracy, from architects to dance teachers, had no choice but to please, flatter and fawn. Rare letters from Kauffman to noble clients are painful in their elaborate deference.[99] Moreover, female artists had to be picturesque themselves, as much an ornament as their paintings. If Kauffman failed to please, she failed to work. Charm was obligatory. Without some allure she would have no entrée in polite society, or the artistic fraternity. Yet sexual innuendo could result in expulsion from court and the haemorrhage of polite customers.

Kauffman's caution, obsession with propriety and saintly presentation make it all the more extraordinary that she was inveigled into a hurried marriage with a Swedish impostor improbably named the Graf Friedrich de Horn on 22 November 1767. Whatever Kauffman's illusions, the fantasy was short-lived, as de Horn immediately demanded funds and the existence of a German wife still living emerged. The Kauffmans paid the cad to sign a deed of separation and leave the country. In 1778 the marriage was annulled.[100] Kauffman let it be known that the marriage was not consummated, and tried to emerge with her reputation for virginity intact.

The scandal did not sink her. Quite why is open to debate. This intrigue might have finished a noblewoman, never mind a cultural producer. Perhaps Kauffman's foreignness exempted her from the opprobrium a native might have suffered, but a loophole for exotics seems unlikely. Doubtless her greatest protection lay in continuing royal patronage. George III was affronted by sexual adventure in ladies, even proposing that adulteresses should be barred from remarriage and court. On the other hand, the royals sheltered Lady Charlotte Finch, the royal governess, when she left her violent husband in 1765.[101] They probably chose to see Angelica similarly, as an unsullied victim. The queen was widely believed to have urged the inclusion of Moser and Kauffman in the founding roster at the RA. Perhaps the young German queen (who was only twenty-four in 1768) felt a special sympathy for the twenty-seven-year-old German speaking *émigrée*.[102]

Kauffman's survival in the face of disgrace is an extraordinary mark of brand equity. She had established a professional character of such unworldliness that she could be forgiven. Not that Kauffman was an ingénue passively accepting the protection of the powerful. In 1775 the Irish enamellist Nathaniel Hone submitted *The Conjurer* to the seventh exhibition of the Royal Academy. The deaf old man in the centre was understood to be Reynolds, while the adoring girl-child at his knee was taken for Kauffman. Worse, one of the prints in the background depicted a woman, naked but for a pair of black boots, brandishing a paintbrush. Kauffman considered herself defamed. She refused to receive a placatory visit from Hone and dispatched a letter of icy outrage to the Academicians.

> If they fear the loss of an academician who pays no respect to that sex – I hope I may enjoy the liberty of leaving to them the pleasure of that academician and withdrawing one object who never willingly deserved his or their Ridicule.
> [...] send home my pictures if that is to be exhibited.[103]

The letter was read aloud in committee, who balloted in Kauffman's favour. Despite Hone's protests, the offensive painting was removed.[104] That their president was the prime target may have swayed the Academy, but the slander was potentially much more ruinous to Kauffman. 'And pray what business did you have to bring Angelica into it?', Nollekens upbraided Hone. 'You know it was your intention to ridicule her, whatever you or your printed paper and your affidavits may say; however you may [depend] upon it she won't forget it.'[105]

It is testimony to Kauffman's success in sloughing off dishonour that her disastrous marriage was not taken up in visual satire. Bigamy, imposture and failed consummation involving a paintress and a charlatan called de Horn had to be suggestive themes for satirists. Yet Kauffman's mortification passed uncelebrated. She did not escape all assault, however. The embittered Nathaniel Dance undermined her in *Angelica Kauffman Drawing a Torso*, suggesting her drawing was both weak and faintly lewd. Dance also mocked her intimacy with Reynolds in an unflattering pencil drawing of the pair. Moreover any generic caricature of female artistry implicated the small number of female professionals. The daft dilettante in *The Paintress* (1772) resembles Kauffman.[106] Yet compared with the abuse heaped on the sculptor Anne Damer, the historian Catherine Macaulay or the politician Georgiana, duchess of Devonshire, the satire is tame. Kauffman is presented as silly and second-rate, but neither depraved nor Amazonian. Fellow artists may have enjoyed her discomfiture in private, but they tended to see her as luckless victim and, for the most part, resisted public derision.

Kauffman would hardly have been made a founder member of the Royal Academy in 1768 (the same year as the separation), if she had not retained the good opinion of the establishment. Nor would she have been commissioned to provide four parts of painting for the ceiling of the council room of the Royal Academy or included in their scheme to decorate the interior of St Paul's Cathedral. Even more telling was Kauffman's inclusion in Richard Samuel's *Nine Living Muses* in 1778, alongside a clutch of Bluestockings, a retired singer and a tragedienne, all swathed in pseudo-classical robes.[107] An associated print fronted the *Lady's New and Polite Pocket Memorandum Book* for 1778. As Elizabeth Montagu laughed, 'it is charming to think how our praises will ride about the world in everybody's pocket [...] I do not see how we could be more universally celebrated.'[108] A Catholic separated wife was broadcast as the acme of ladylike British achievement. Kauffman even lent her first name and a series of plates to *Angelica's Ladies Library*, a compendium of moral advice for girls published in 1794.[109]

Why Kauffman succeeded where others failed is a useful question. Only one other woman, the flower painter Mary Moser, was fully recognised by the Academy. Kauffman exhibited seventy-nine works between 1769 and 1797, while Moser exhibited thirty-six between 1769 and 1802. Yet these two were hardly the only female painters in London. Surveying the RA's index of exhibitors in their archive between 1769 and 1802 reveals a scatter of women designated 'artist'. Mrs Eliza Cook, a 'miniature painter', listed at several London addresses, showed seven pieces between 1777 and 1786; Miss Mary Bertrand, 'painter', exhibited ten items between 1772 and 1800. Among the honorary exhibitors there are yet more pieces 'by a young lady'. Miss Mary Benwell, another 'miniature painter', showed twenty paintings before her marriage, and another eighteen afterwards, as Mrs Code. None of which is to suggest anything approaching equality. For instance, in 1777 there were 190 exhibitors, of whom 15 were women (a scant 8 per cent), and of 364 paintings 27 were by women (7 per cent).[110] However, for all their minority status, it is still striking that the female artists were there at all, and seem to have been making a professional living, supported to a degree by the Royal Academy.

Certification and the endorsement of institutions hallmark the trustworthiness of a brand.[111] The accreditation of the Royal Academy itself was not a negligible asset. The careers of other female artists such as Katherine Read were seen to be hobbled by the lack of institutional credentials.[112] Academic exhibitions forged an audience for Kauffman's work and guaranteed that her paintings would be reviewed, while her membership was an inviolable accolade and reputational shield. Both Kauffman and Moser could vote in elections and on the distribution of medals and scholarships, though they were not

expected to attend meetings in person, and neither was admitted to the council or life-drawing class. Moser stood gamely, but unsuccessfully, for president. Nevertheless, the evidence of the archive suggests Kauffman's concerns were handled respectfully. She signed all her London work 'R.A.'.

Male gossips attributed Kauffman's success to flirtation rather than talent. However there is a more mundane explanation: sheer industry. Kauffman's work rate was famous. 'She is incredibly productive', noted the Danish ambassador, while Goethe marvelled at her indefatigability.[113] A Scottish portraitist, Ann Forbes (1745-1834), was seen to lack the health for the London art market, in contrast to 'the famous Miss Angelica, who, added to her great facility, has such a constitution that she is able to work from 5 in the morning till sunset in the summer, and during the whole daylight in winter'.[114] Kauffman's effort confirmed Reynolds's view that artists 'who are determined to excel must go to their work whether willing or unwilling, morning, noon and night'.[115]

Kauffman's performance of relentless sweetness bears comparison with the deliberate chastity of public intellectuals. Deborah Heller argues that Bluestockings adhered to a strict regime of decorous femininity that helped them 'secure liberation on other fronts'.[116] On the other hand, female colonisation of letters stands in stark contrast to the tiny minority of accredited female artists. But the requirements of authorship were far easier to fulfil than art.[117] Training required only literacy, access to a library and a desk, its creation only time and solitude. Even the exposure of publication could be offset by anonymity. There could be no separation of product from person for portraitists. Yet publicity was fatal to virtuous feminine reputation. Therein lay Kauffman's professional dilemma.

Without the protection of invisibility, Kauffman's reputational risks were more akin to those of performers than of authors. Sarah Siddons's success in becoming 'the most public woman of the day' without sacrificing her claim to respectability is akin to Kauffman's achievement. The key planks of PR for actresses, finds Kimberly Crouch, were the projection of respectable maternity, charity and high-status friendships.[118] Kauffman had no babies to exhibit and kept her charity personal and discreet. She wrote no apologetic memoir. She did not show herself to an audience of hundreds, but she exhibited herself at her easel to small groups in what some men saw as tantalising intimacy. While actresses could afford a little notoriety, a female painter who needed fashionable aristocrats to sit in her studio could not. Unlike actresses and authors, Kauffman was endorsed by a professional institution. Unlike actresses, her career outlived her looks. Nevertheless, she shared a strong element of performance.

Ultimately the resilience of the Angelica brand lay in its consistency. Kauffman's management of her personal reputation was indivisible from the prosecution of her career. Work and name were one. A dual conformity was forced upon Kauffman. She had to succeed in male terms to qualify for institutional accreditation, but could not compromise her reputation for virtue. She could expose no real knowledge of the naked male body at risk of career-ending scandal, yet still had to face criticism for anatomical inaccuracy. Femininity in and of itself undermined her claim to greatness for some, as William Chambers opined: 'every female quality in a man tends to lessen his apparent aptitude for the functions he was intended to fulfil.'[119] Much has been made of Kauffman's technical shortcomings. However, given her shrewd appreciation of the market, it is possible to draw another conclusion. Kauffman's vague bodies foreshadow Josiah Wedgwood's decorous motifs; indeed he reproduced many of Kauffman's images. His neo-classical figures were draped in order to conceal 'that part which might give offence to our delicate ladies', or made to sprout figleaves. Wedgwood's partner Thomas Bentley was convinced that nudes were 'too warm' for English taste and encouraged the potter to tone down the

naughtiness of godless classicism for the sober middle market. 'Fig leaves are not always enough', Wedgwood agreed. His Priapus was bedecked with so many flowers that he became a fashion symbol rather than a fertility symbol.[120] Compare the female artist with entrepreneurs and it is easier to detect commercial acumen rather than technical failure. Since both Wedgwood and Matthew Boulton pursued her designs, we can conclude that it was Kauffman who incarnated and led demure taste. Unlike Wedgwood and Boulton, Kauffman left few manuscripts outlining her strategies or incriminating herself as a calculating mercenary. However, the lack of an archive of her self-management should not lead one to assume she was an artless, directionless naif. The fragments that survive bespeak a sharp tactician. No man of her sustained international success across different genres would be credited only with dumb luck. Kauffman was classically educated, well travelled, multilingual, supported her family, sponsored other female artists and made a fortune. The fact that she was still seen as an angelic muse rather than a saleswoman is her achievement. We would be unwise to be taken in. Doubtless she considered herself an artist of genius with a reputation to make and protect, and would not have countenanced the idea that she was anything so sordid as a commercial brand, yet art is a business like any other, and as 'Angelica' she prospered.

Kauffman delicately managed her profile to avoid extremes and crafted her paintings to the expectations of women of taste, who would have shunned anything too visceral and provocative. 'Complacent', 'bland' and 'moderate' were all terms of admiration. Here was a lightly learned neo-classicism that married with their interiors and was easier to live with than blood and gore. It was Kauffman's work itself, well mannered and understated, fusing neo-classicism and sensibility, history and femininity, that endeared her to her female public. Anthony Pasquin complained of 'her harmonious, but shackled fancy', but he missed the commercial point. Whether victims of the Trojan War or Anglo-Saxon strategy, Kauffman's heroines projected restrained feeling, propriety, unaffected manners and grace under pressure. They embodied an ideal that the seemliest female consumers could believe in and inhabit.

In all else but her unfortunate marriage there was a fusion between Kauffman's personal and artistic decorum. As the German diplomat Peter Sturz remarked in 1768: 'In her figure and in her paintings, in her speech and her motions only a single tone is dominant namely virginal dignity.'[121] Though Sturz went on to delineate Kauffman's technical weaknesses, he had nevertheless identified a clear and unified brand identity, that 'single minded proposition' which modern reputation management firms see as the foundation of marque success. Behind every great modern brand 'is a compelling idea, which captures customers' attention and loyalty by filling an unmet or unsatisfied need, or by doing it better than the competition'.[122] The Teflon resilience of her brand lay in the near-perfect blend of demure womanhood, moral charm and virtuous art. The lofty content of Kauffman's art conditioned the way she was seen as a woman, just as sacred oratorios were seen to purify professional singers and just as tragedy uplifted actresses such as Sarah Siddons in ways that the naughtiness of comedy might not.[123] The content of the work regulated the perception of the woman. Certainly her depiction of so many grieving, wronged and deserted women chimed with her own catastrophe and perhaps ennobled her scandal. Kauffman was that rare thing in business, a brand so strong, with such a reservoir of loyalty and trust, that it could be forgiven.[124]

Kauffman policed any disjuncture between the chastity of her person and the grace of her art. The poise she achieved limited her craft but made her career. It is this equilibrium that has made her seem so quaint to posterity and damned her as a flirt not a talent. Ultimately Kauffman did not transgress gender boundaries but became

a refined expression of them. She became the embodiment of what a successful public woman could and could not do in Georgian England. Her art may not always be considered first-rate, but her brand management was superb. Ultimately Kauffman's brand was her cleverest creation.

NOTES

Versions of this paper were given at seminars at Stonybrook, SUNY, and the California Institute of Technology, USA, the University of Uppsala, Sweden, and the German Historical Institute in the National Gallery of Scotland, London. I thank the organisers and audiences at all venues. For criticisms and careful readings, I would like to thank Mikael Alm, Patrick Barwise, Alison Margaret Bigelow, Lisa Cody, Michele Cohen, Elizabeth Eger, Anne Goldgar, Hannah Greig, Karen Harvey, Gill Perry, Kate Retford, Kate Roach, John Styles and the anonymous readers of *JECS*. I also owe a particular debt to the archivists of the Royal Academy, the Shropshire Record Office, the East Sussex Record Office, the Wiltshire Record Office and the Huntington Library, as well as to curators at the V&A, the Uffizi and the Huntington for access to prints and paintings not on public view.

1. William Shakespeare, Othello, Act III, scene iii, l.155-61.

2. Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1998), Chapter 6; Alexandra Shepard, *Accounting for Oneself: Worth, Status and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Margot Finn, *The Character of Credit: Personal Debt in English Culture, 1740-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), introduction; John Smail, 'Credit, Risk, and Honor in Eighteenth-Century Commerce', *Journal of British Studies* 44:3 (2005), p.439-56.

3. James Fordyce, 'On Modesty of Apparel', in *Sermons to Young Women* ([1766] Philadelphia, PA, 1809), Sermon 2, p.22.

4. Rita Clifton et al., *Brands and Branding* (London: The Economist/Profile Books, 2009); Jane Pavitt (ed.), *Brand New* (London: V&A, 2000).

5. Carlo Marco Belfanti, 'Branding before the Brand: Marks, Imitations and Counterfeits in Pre-Modern Europe', *Business History 60:8* (2017), p.1127-46; Corine Maitte, 'Labels, Brands, and Market Integration in the Modern Era', *Business and Economic History Online* 7https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261025847_Labels_Brands_and_market_integration_in_the_modern_era_Bussiness_and_Economic_History_on_line_2009_wwwthebhcorgpublicationsBEHonline2009maittepdf [accessed 1 July 2018]; Maxine Berg, 'From Imitation to Invention: Creating Commodities in Eighteenth-century Britain', *Economic History Review* 55 (2002), p.1-30.

6. Belfanti, 'Branding'.

7. John Styles, 'Product Innovation in Early Modern London', *Past and Present* 168 (2000), p.148-58; Kimberly Alexander, '" Goods to America"': The Hose Family Exports Shoes from London, c.1730-1797', *The Portsmouth Athenaeum Journal* (2013), p.30-45.

8. Letter from Gottlob Friedrich Ernst Graf Schonborn to Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, 19 October 1781, quoted and translated in in Angelica Kauffman: A Woman of Immense Talent, exh. cat., Vorarlberger Landesmuseum, Bregenz (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2007), p.284.

9. Royal Academy Archives (RAA), RAA/SEC/1/28.

10. Angelica Gooden, *Miss Angel:* The Art and World of Angelica Kauffman: Eighteenth-Century Icon (London: Pimlico, 2006), p.316.

11. Kenneth Garlick and Angus Macintyre (eds), *The Diary of Joseph Farington* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1978), vol. I.100.

12. Charles Robert Leslie, *Memoirs of the Life of John Constable, Esq., R.A.* (London, 1845).

13. Wendy Wassyng Roworth, 'Kauffman and the Art of Painting in England', in Wendy Wassyng Roworth (ed.), *Angelica Kauffman: A Continental Artist in Georgian England* (London: Reaktion Books, 1992), p.37; Angela Rosenthal, *Angelica Kauffman:* Art and Sensibility (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2006), p.15-30.

14. Germaine Greer, *The Obstacle Race: The Fortunes of Women Painters and their Work* (New York: Farrar Straus & Giroux, 1982), p.80.

15. Image available at: https://www.rct.uk/collection/400747/the-academicians-of-the-royal-academy

16. Rosenthal, Angelica Kauffman: Art and Sensibility, p.49, 52.

17. Roszika Parker and Grizelda Pollock, *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1981), p.90; Whitney Chadwick, *Women, Art and Society,* 4th edn (London: Thames and Hudson, 2007), p.7.

18. The RA's predecessor, the Society of Arts (1754), also accepted female members. See Marcia Pointon, *Strategies for Showing: Women, Possession, and Representation in English Visual Culture 1665-1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p.134, 138.

19. Peter Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London, 1660-1730* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989), p.158-74; Margaret Hunt, *The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender and the Family in England, 1680-1780* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996), p.125-46; Nicola Phillips, *Women in Business*, 1700-1850 (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2006); Hannah Barker, *The Business of Women: Female Enterprise and Urban Development in Northern England, 1760-1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

20. Amy Erickson, 'Married Women's Occupations in Eighteenth-Century London', *Continuity and Change* 23: 2 (2008), p.267-307.

21. Philippa Glanville, 'Women and Goldsmithing', in Philippa Glanville and Jennifer Faulds Goldsborough (eds), Women Silversmiths, 1685-1845 (Washington, DC: Thames and Hudson, 1990), p.13-28; Zara Anishanslin, *Portrait of a Woman in Silk* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017); Alison Kelly, *Mrs Coade's Stone* (Upton-upon-Severn: Self Publishing Association, 1990).

22. Earle, The Making of the English Middle Class, p.158-74; Erickson, 'Married Women's Occupations'.

23. Hunt, Middling Sort, p.137

24. Erickson, 'Married Women's Occupations', p. 293.

25. Amy Erickson, 'Eleanor Mosley and Other Milliners in the City of London Companies 1700-1750', *History Workshop Journal* 71 (2011), p.166.

26. Vivien Jones, *Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity* (London: Routledge, 1990); Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Kathryn Shevelow, *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the Early Periodical* (London: Routledge, 1989).

27. Amanda Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1998).

28. James Boswell, *The Life of Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, 2nd edn, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934-64), vol. II. 362.

29. Garlick and Macintyre (eds), *Diary of Joseph Farington*, vol. III.664.

30. Amanda Vickery, 'The Theory and Practice of Female Accomplishment', in Mark Laird and Alicia Weisberg-Roberts (eds), Mrs Delany and Her Circle (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009), p.99-109.

31. Wilhelm Schramm, *Die Malerin Angelika Kauffman* (Brunn, 1890), p.45-7.

32. Stella Tillyard, 'Paths of Glory: Fame and the Public in Eighteenth Century London', in Martin Postle (ed.), *Joshua Reynolds: The Creation of Celebrity* (London: Tate, 2005), p.61-9; Heather McPherson, *Art & Celebrity : In the Age of Reynolds and Siddons* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania

State University Press, 2017); Julia H. Fawcett, *Spectacular Disappearances: Celebrity and Privacy, 1696-1801* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2016); Antoine Lilti and Lynn Carol Jeffress, *The Invention of Celebrity: 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2017); Leo Braudy, *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and Its History*(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

33. Gill Perry, *Spectacular Flirtation: Viewing the Actress in British Art and Theatre, 1768-1820* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2007); Robyn Asleson (ed.), *Notorious Muse: The Actress in British Art and Culture, 1776-1812* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2003).

34. Felicity Nussbaum, Rival Queens*: Actresses, Performance and the Eighteenth-Century British Theatre* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), p.16.

35. Elizabeth Eger and Lucy Peltz, *Brilliant Women: Eighteenth-Century Bluestockings* (London: NPG Publications/Yale University Press, 2008), p.22, 73, 76; Elizabeth Eger, *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), *passim*.

36. Cited in Lucy Peltz, 'A Revolution in Female Manners: Women, Politics and Reputation in the Late Eighteenth Century', in *Eger and Peltz, Brilliant Women*, p.99. See also the scurrilous attack, 'A Speedy and Effectual Preparation for the Next World' (1777): https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?assetId=112683001&objectId=1478865&partId=1 [accessed 21 November 2016].

37. Stella Tillyard, *Aristocrats: Caroline, Emily, Louisa and Sarah Lennox, 1740-1832* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1994), p. 257-61, 295.

38. Chuck Brymer, 'What Makes Brands Great?', and Deborah Bowker, 'The Public Relations Perspective on Branding', in *Clifton et al., Brands*, p.65-76, 152-4.

39. Clifton et al., *Brands*, p.xiii-xiv.

40. Most of Kauffman's extant correspondence is collected in Schramm, *Die Malerin Angelika Kauffman*, though a handful of letters survive in family collections in local archives in Britain. See below.

41. Reproduced in Schramm, Die Malerin Angelika Kauffman, p.45-7.

42. Jean Andre Rouquet, *The Present State of the Arts in England* ([1755] London: Cornmarket Press, 1970), p.42-3.

43. Richard Wendorf, *Sir Joshua Reynolds: The Painter in Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), p.103-9.

44. Reproduced in Schramm, Die Malerin Angelika Kauffman, p.45-7.

45. John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1997), p.224.

46. Cited in Lady Victoria Manners and D. C. Williamson, *Angelica Kauffman R.A.: Her Life and Works* (London: Bodley Head, 1929), p.36.

47. Rosenthal, Angelica Kauffman: Art and Sensibility, p.90-94, D. Mannings, 'At the Portrait Painters. How the Painters of the Eighteenth Century Conducted their Studios and Sittings', *History Today* 27 (1977), p.279-87.

48. Self-Portrait of the Artist Hesitating between the Arts of Music and Painting, 1794; http://www.nationaltrustcollections.org.uk/object/960079

49. Susan Staves, 'The Learned Female Soprano', in Elizabeth Eger and Lucy Peltz (eds), *Bluestockings Displayed: Portraiture, Performance and Patronage, 1730-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p.141-63.

50. Richard Leppert, *Music and Image: Domesticity, Ideology and Socio-Cultural Formation in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

51. Cited in Rosenthal, Angelica Kauffman: Art and Sensibility, p.91.

52. Joseph Roach, 'Mistaking Heaven for Earth: Eliza Linley's Voice', *in Eger and Peltz (eds), Bluestockings Displayed*, p. 123-40.

53. Rosenthal, Angelica Kauffman: Art and Sensibility, p.92; Greer, Obstacle Race, p.91.

54. Kim Sloan, *'A Noble Art': Amateur Artists and Drawing Masters, c.1600-1800* (London: British Museum Press, 2000), p.7.

55. Brymer, 'What Makes Brands Great?' in *Clifton et al., Brands*, p.66-7.

56. Rosenthal, 'The Image of Angelica', in Rosenthal, *Angelica Kauffman:* Art and Sensibility, p.223-83; Alison Conway, *Private Interests: Women, Portraiture and the Visual Culture of the English Novel, 1709-1791* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), p.179-81.

57. Rosenthal, *Angelica Kauffman:* Art and Sensibility, p.269.

58. Wendy Wassyng Roworth 'Ancient Matrons and Modern Patrons', in Melissa Hyde and Jennifer Milam (eds), Women, Art and the Politics of Identity in Eighteenth-Century Europe (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003), p.188-210; Rosenthal, Angelica Kauffman: Art and Sensibility, p.15-41; Griselda Pollock, 'Rewriting the Story of Art: Painting, Femininity and Success in Eighteenth-Century London', *Women's Art Magazine* 50 (January/February 1993); Anne Bermingham, *Learning to Draw: Studies in the Cultural History of a Polite and Useful Art* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2000), p.155.

59. Valardi Sketchbook, Victoria & Albert Museum, London (V&A), E 431-1927.

60. Roworth, 'Anatomy Is Destiny: Regarding the Body in the Art of Angelica Kauffman', in Gill Perry and Michael Rossington (eds), *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), p.58.

61. Roworth, 'Kauffman and the Art of Painting', p.83.

62. Extract from 'The Ear-Wig', 1781, RAA.

63. Elizabeth Foster, Ickworth, 11 November 1781, to 'My Lord', East Sussex Record Office, AMS 5440/106.

64. This is a phrase of Desmond Shawe-Taylor, *The Georgians: Eighteenth-Century Portraiture and Society* (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1990), p.156.

65. Angela Rosenthal, 'Kauffman and Portraiture', in Roworth (ed.), *Angelica Kauffman: A Continental Artist*, p.109; Marcia Pointon, 'Portrait Painting as a Commercial Enterprise in London in the 1780s', *Art History* vii (1984), p.187-205; D. Mannings, 'Notes on Some Early Eighteenth-Century Portrait Prices in England', Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies vi (1983), p.185-96; Shawe-Taylor, Georgians, p.22.

66. Letter from Angelica Kauffman to Daniel Daulby, 30 December 1778, National Portrait Gallery, London.

67. See Robert Parker's account book, Saltram House, Devon.

68. Garlick and Macintyre (eds), *Diary of Joseph Farington*, vol. I.90.

69. *Public Advertiser* 12981 (Friday, 25 March 1774).

70. Bermingham, Learning To Draw.

71. Kauffman recommending an engraver named Bleith, 19 February 1777, RAA, JU/1/73.

72. David Alexander, 'Kauffman and the Print Market in Eighteenth-Century England', in Roworth (ed.), *Angelica Kauffman: A Continental Artist*, p.141.

73. Malise Forbes Adam and Mary Mauchline, 'Kauffman's Decorative Work', in Roworth (ed.), *Angelica Kauffman: A Continental Artist*, p. 113.

74. Adam and Mauchline, '*Kauffman's Decorative Work*', p. 113.

75. Adam and Mauchline, '*Kauffman's Decorative Work*', p. 122.

76. London Chronicle (30 April-2 May 2 1773), p.421.

77. Royal Academy Critiques, vol. 1 (1769-93), p. 23, RAA.

78. Royal Academy Critiques, vol. 1 (1769-93), p. 92, RAA.

79. See William Vaughan '"David's Brickdust" and the Rise of the British School', in Alison Yarrington and Kelvin Everest (eds), *Reflections of Revolution: Images of Romanticism* (London: Routledge, 1993), p.134-58.

80. Royal Academy Critiques, vol. 1 (1769-93), p.92, RAA.

81. Ann Bahr Thompson, 'Brand Positioning and Brand Creation', in Clifton et al., *Brands*, p.79-95.

82. Rosenthal, 'Kauffman and Portraiture', in Roworth (ed.), *Angelica Kauffman: A Continental Artist*, p.103-4.

83. Amanda Vickery, 'Fashioning Difference in Georgian England: Furniture for Him and for Her', in Paula Findlen (ed.), *Early Modern Things: Objects and Their Histories, 1500-1800* (London: Routledge, 2012), p.342-59.

84. *The Letters and Journals of Lady Mary Coke* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1889), vol. I.24.

85. Letter from Angelica Kauffman to her father, 10 February 1767, cited in Schramm, Die Malerin Angelica Kauffman, p.274.

86. Amanda Vickery, *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England* (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 2009), p.145-56.

87. [87]Lady Shelburne's Diary, 27 May 1767, Bowood House, fol. 187.

88. 'Character of the late Hon. Mrs Parker', Gentleman's Magazine, 1st ser., 46 (1776), p.75.

89. British Library, Add. MS 48, 218.

90. *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany* ed. Lady Llanover, 2nd ser. (London: R. Bentley, 1862), vol. I.329.

91. Laird and Weisberg-Roberts (eds), *Mrs Delany and Her Circle*.

92. *Anna Larpent's diary*, vol. I, 1790-95, *c.*7 April 1790, Huntington Library (HL), H.M. 31201.

93. Diary, vol. I, 1790-95, 19 March 1792, HL, H.M. 31201.

94. Methodized Journal, HL, H.M. 31201, vol. XVII, fols 150, 151, 116, 71.

95. Shropshire Record Office, 1066/31 October 1808, fol. 32.

96. Steve Hilton, 'The Social Value of Brands', and Bowker, 'Public Relations', in Clifton et al., *Brands*, p.47-64, 152-4.

97. Garlick and Macintyre (eds), *Diary of Joseph Farington*, vol. III.763, 938, vol. IV.3192, vol. VI.4037.

98. Isabella Hadfield to Mary Hadfield, 8 March 1777, RAA, HU/2/55.

99. Angelica Kauffman, Rome, to Lord Bruce, Seymour Place, Mayfair, London, 1 March 1800, Wiltshire Record Office, 9/35/179.

100. Wendy Wassyng Roworth, 'Angelica in Love: Gossip, Rumour, Romance and Scandal', in *Angelica Kauffman: A Woman of Immense Talent*, exh. cat., p. 42-51.

101. H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), online edn; http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-75524 [accessed 1 September 2016].

102. Art historians have long believed that the support of Queen Charlotte was critical to female artists. See the inferences drawn in Heidi Strobel, 'Royal "Matronage" of Women Artists in the Late Eighteenth Century', *Woman's Art Journal* 26:2 (Fall 2005/Winter 2006), and Heidi Strobel, *The Artistic Matronage of Queen Charlotte (1744-1818): How a Queen Promoted Both Art and Female Artists in English Society* (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2011). However, I have yet to find direct confirmation in the queen's manuscripts in the Royal Collection.

103. RAA/SEC/1/7.

104. 18 April 1775, RAA, minutes, fol. 198; Hone to Jm Newton Esq, 19 April 1775, RAA/SEC/1/8.

105. John Thomas Smith, *Nollekens and His Times*, 2nd edn (London, 1829), vol. I.131.

106. Anon., after Robert Dighton, *The Paintress*, published by W. Humphrey, 15 May 1772; http://images.library.yale.edu/walpoleweb/fullzoom.asp?imageid=lwlpr03349 [accessed 6 January 2015].

107. Elizabeth Eger, 'Representing Culture: The Nine Living Muses of Great Britain 1779', in Elizabeth Eger et al. (eds), *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere, 1700-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.104-32.

108. Elizabeth Montagu to Elizabeth Carter, 24 November 1777, HL, Mo 3435.

109. *Angelica's Ladies Library* (London, 1794).

110. RAA, exhibition catalogues, 1777.

111. Allan Poulter, 'Brand Protection', in Clifton et al., *Brands*, p.157-68.

112. This was the view of Abbé Peter Grant, Roman agent for the Catholic Church in Scotland. Dorcas Taylor, 'Katherine Read', in Delia Gaze (ed.), *Dictionary of Female Artists* (London: Routledge, 1997), vol. II.1114.

113. Cited in Cantz, Kauffman, p.284.

114. Patricia Andrew, 'Scottish Artists in London: Success and Failure', in Stana Nenadic (ed.), *Scots in London in the Eighteenth Century* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2010), p.221.

115. Wendorf, Sir Joshua Reynolds, p.91.

116. Deborah Heller, 'Subjectivity Unbound: Elizabeth Vesey as the Sylph in Bluestocking Correspondence', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65:1 (2002), p.215-34.

117. Linda Nochlin, 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?', Art News (January 1971), p.22-39, 67-71.

118. Kimberly Crouch, 'The Public Life of Actresses: Prostitutes or Ladies?', in Hannah Barker and Elaine Chalus (eds), *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), p.58-78. See also Judith Pascoe, *Romantic Theatricality: Gender, Poetry and Spectatorship* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1997), p.7, 15.

119. Around 1770-90, RAA/CHA/3/38.

120. Neil McKendrick, 'Josiah Wedgwood and Thomas Bentley: An Inventor Entrepreneur Partnership in the Industrial Revolution', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (1964), p.26.

121. Cited in Rosenthal, *Angelica Kauffman:* Art and Sensibility , p.189.

122. Brymer, 'What Makes Brands Great?' in Clifton et al., Brands, p.66.

123. Kimberly Crouch, 'Actresses in Eighteenth-Century England', PhD diss., Oxford University, 1995.

124. On 'sustaining brand value in crisis' see Deborah Bowker, 'The Public Relations Perspective on Branding', in Clifton et al., *Brands*, p.152-4.

AMANDA VICKERY is a prize-winning historian, writer and broadcaster. She is Professor of Early Modern History at Queen Mary, University of London. Her books include *Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England* (2009), *Women, Privilege and Power: British Politics 1750 to the Present* (2001), *Gender, Taste and Material Culture in Britain and North America* (2006) and *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (1998), which won the Wolfson, the Whitfield and the Longman-History Today Prize.